

THE BEST TEST of beer is what people do about it; not what somebody says.

And what the people actually DO is to
buy Budweiser.

Americans have a reputation for sensing character; and once
they prove it they'll stand without hitching.

That's why they're standing by BUDWEISER today—they have proven
the Budweiser-character for pre-eminent purity and quality.

Budweiser sales are the highest in the world, yet the
Budweiser-price-at-the-brewery is also the highest.

If we ever permitted Budweiser to lose in quality, it would
inevitably lose in popularity and sales.

But we won't; therefore it can't. Budweiser is its own best test.

Anheuser-Busch ST. LOUIS.
AUG. RIEKE & SON, Distributors, Ironton, Mo.

You believe in the majority rule—that's why your county is "wet" or "dry"—majority of the people are ruling. When Missouri votes on the "wet" and "dry" proposition, November 8th, should not the majority rule? Of course it should, say you, and so say we all, but it may not. If the state gives a "dry" majority, all the state will be "dry," a majority ruling—that's one way the prohibition rule works. But if the state votes "wet," all the state will not be "wet," a majority not ruling—that's the other way the prohibition rule doesn't work.

A "wet" majority of 100,000 will not make one additional foot of "wet" territory in Missouri, while a "dry" majority of one vote will make all of the "wet" territory "dry." In other words, the prohibition majority rule does not work both ways. Is this a square deal? Is it fair and right? If a majority can make all the state "dry" why should not a majority make all the state "wet?"

Who will answer? Your county has home rule—you have dealt with the liquor traffic without outside interference—that is American and Democratic. But why should not the large cities have home rule, too, and be permitted to deal with the liquor question as seemeth best to them, without outside interference? You don't want the cities to govern you in this matter; why should you want to govern the cities?

Don't you think that if your county is permitted to be "wet" or "dry" as it may elect, that the cities should have the same right? Isn't that fair? Isn't the Home Rule a square deal for cities and country alike?

If you think the prohibition rule should be made to work both ways, vote against the prohibition amendment.

If you think a majority should rule vote against the prohibition amendment.

If you believe in Home Rule vote against the prohibition amendment. A "wet" vote is a vote to leave the country "dry" as it now is, and to leave the cities "wet" as they now are. Isn't that the fair way to settle the matter—doing unto the cities as you would have the cities do unto the country, making the Home Rule work both ways.

THINK IT OVER.

DEMOCRATIC OFFICIALS ALWAYS MAKE GOOD.

In view of the fact that the Missouri Republicans made the campaign of 1908 largely upon the amount of interest collected by State Treasurer Jacob Gmelich, a comparison of his record with that of Judge James Cowgill, the present Democratic state treasurer, is timely.

During Treasurer Gmelich's four-year term he collected and turned into the state treasury interest aggregating \$289,477.00, or an average of \$6,000 per month. Treasurer Cowgill in the 20 months he has been in office has collected and paid into the treasury \$157,350.48, or \$7,867 per month, a monthly balance in favor of the Democratic official of \$1,867—more than \$60 per day.

Treasurer Gmelich's contracts with the financial institutions for the safekeeping of the state funds for four years averaged 2.994 per cent on daily balances. Judge Cowgill succeeded in making four-year contracts that averaged 3.294 per cent on daily balances, a 10 per cent increase in favor of the Democratic official.

Here is Gmelich's interest record by years:

1905 \$76,018.81

1906 77,266.97

1907 80,748.92

1908 55,442.79

Total for 4 years \$289,477.49

Here is Cowgill's record for one year and eight months:

1909 \$90,521.44

1910 (eight months) 66,829.04

Total, 20 months \$157,350.48

Judge Cowgill has collected more interest for the first 20 months of his administration than Gmelich did for the entire first two years of his administration. The fact must be borne in mind, too, that included in the money handled by Gmelich during the first three years of his administration was the sum of \$475,198.13, received April 8, 1905, from the United States government, and held until September, 1907, when it was apportioned and paid to the several counties in the state, by act of the general assembly.

During the 1908 campaign the Globe-Democrat printed column after column about the interest collected by Gmelich, and his record, at the suggestion of Hadley, was incorporated in the Republican party platform two years ago. Neither the Globe-Democrat nor Hadley have said anything about the interest record of State Treasurer Cowgill. Democratic officials always make good.

REGISTER office for job work.



For us by
PETERS
SHOE
CO.
St. Louis

MILLINERY.

OUR Millinery Department this Season is under the management of our new Milliner, MISS WILLIAMSON, a Thoroughly Trained Milliner.

We have the Latest Styles, Shapes and Colors. SPECIAL PRICE on two or more Hats, or Hat and Cloak or Coat.

We Have Some Splendid Values in Hats.

CLOAKS.—COATS

Our Line of Cloaks is Unsurpassed in Quality and Price.

INFANTS'—75c, \$1.00, 1.25, 1.50, 2.00, 2.50.

CHILDREN'S—\$1.00, 1.50, 1.65, 2.00, 2.50, 3.00, 4.25.

LADIES'—\$3.95, 4.25, 4.50, 5.25, 6.00, 7.50, 10.00.

Special Price on Two or more Cloaks.

SHOES. If you want to get a Splendid Pair of Shoes that will Feel Good, Look Well, Last Long, come to us. Good for the Price.

INFANTS'—25c, 35c, 50c.

CHILD'S—60c, 75c, \$1.00, 1.25, 1.50, 2.00.

MISSIES'—\$1.00, 1.25, 1.50, 1.75, 2.00, 2.25.

LADIES'—\$1.50, 1.75, 1.90, 2.00, 2.25, 2.50, 2.75, 2.85, 3.00.

MEN'S—\$1.60, 1.75, 2.00, 2.10, 2.25, 2.50, 2.75, 3.00, 3.25, 3.50, 3.75, 4.00.

CORSETS.

We have the EXCLUSIVE SALE in Ironton of the



Underwear.

INFANTS' WOOL SHIRTS—25c.

CHILD'S U. SHIRTS—25c, 50c.

CHILD'S SHIRTS OR DRAWERS—20c, 25c, 35c.

MISSIES' VESTS OR PANTS—25c, 50c.

LADIES' VESTS OR PANTS—25c, 50c.

MISSIES' U. SUITS—50c, 75c.

LADIES' " "—50c, 75c.

MEN'S SHIRTS OR DRAWERS—45c, 50c.

BOYS' SHIRTS OR DRAWERS—25c, 30c, 35c, 50c.

MEN'S U. SUITS—\$1.00.

BOYS' " "—25c, 50c.

Special—Men's Fall Suits, 85c.

"American Beauty" Corsets.

Ask your friends who wear them how they like them, and they will tell you.

Prices, 25c, 50c, 75c, 85c, \$1.00, \$1.50.

B. N. BROWN, IRONTON.

"We Can Save You Money."



AMERICAN BEAUTY STYLE 1488

Kalamazoo Corset Co., Makers

Special Prices on Shoes

—AT THE—
Enterprise Shoe & Grocery Store
FOR THIRTY DAYS ONLY.

Men's Shoes were \$4.50 now \$4.00	Women's Shoes were \$1.50 now \$1.35
" " " \$4.00 " \$3.50	Misses' " " \$2.00 " \$1.65
" " " \$3.00 " \$2.50	" " " \$1.05 " \$1.05
" " " \$2.50 " \$2.00	Children's " " \$1.00 " .85c
" " " \$1.50 " \$1.20	" " " .35c " .45c
Women's " " \$3.00 " \$2.50	Boys' " " \$2.00 " \$1.85
" " " \$2.25 " \$1.90	" " " \$1.75 " \$1.50
" " " \$2.00 " \$1.75	

OUR LEADER IS FRESH FRUIT.

BRICK BUILDING, South of Court House Sq. **M. NICHOLS, Prop'r.**

State-Wide Prohibition.

Gov. Hadley's Position.

In a letter written to Walter S. Dickey, May 13, 1908, Gov. Hadley tersely defined his position on Statewide Prohibition and among other things said:

"I am not in favor of state-wide prohibition. I do not believe that the cause of temperance or good government would be subserved by the adoption of such an amendment in this state. Missouri is an empire in itself, not only in geographical extent in the magnitude and diversity of its resources and industries, but also in the marked difference in the habits, customs and conditions in the life of the people in the different sections of the country. All of these circumstances, in my opinion, emphasize the difficulty of undertaking to establish and enforce in the entire state a system of laws affecting the personal habits of the people, and interfering with what many regard as their rights of personal liberty.

Under our present system of laws, the people of the several counties and cities have the right to adopt prohibition therein. I not only believe in the fairness of this legislation, but also believe that such amendments should from time to time be adopted to those local option laws as will result in the future restriction and suppression of the evils of the liquor traffic.

Stone Against It.
(From the Republic Oct. 1st.) Senator Stone, who was in St. Louis yesterday was asked for his opinion on the Prohibition amendment and said:

"I think the amendment will be defeated by a decisive majority. I expect to see a majority of the counties vote for the amendment, but I expect to see the majority in the counties voting against it offset the majority given by the counties voting for it, so that the vote as it will come to St. Louis, Kansas City and St. Joseph will be pretty evenly balanced and those three cities will give a large majority against it.

"I feel quite sure the amendment will be defeated this year, and I hope it will end the struggle in this state. But it may not. That depends.

"Personally, as I imagine all know, for I have stated my position frequently, I am opposed—absolutely opposed—to State-wide Prohibition. I am in favor of the local option policy as it stands in the law to-day.

"Aside from the revenue feature of the question, which is one of

grave concern, and aside from the question of dealing justly with men who have invested on the faith of our long-declared public policy, and of dealing justly with the thousands employed by these considerations, and looking at the subject solely from the standpoint of morality, sobriety and good order, I would resist a proposition to force prohibition upon a community opposed to it. The Democratic party has always opposed blue laws and sumptuary legislation, and I am a Democrat."

Views of Churchmen.

Montgomery, Mo., Sept. 30, '10. Before departing from St. Louis to-day, Bishop Tuttle of the Episcopal Church gave out the following interview for publication:

"All true Americans, it seems to me, ought to strive to maintain and perpetuate American principles. I think local self-government is an American principle. State-wide Prohibition violates and local option supports this principle, therefore I am opposed to state-wide prohibition and in favor of local option."

In addition to his office of Bishop of Missouri, Bishop Tuttle has for several years been presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. This office which is determined by seniority in the House of Bishops, he will hold until his death.

"I side with Bishop Tuttle," declared the Rev. J. W. McKittrick, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Sarah Street and Washington Boulevard, when told that the Episcopal clergyman had taken a decided stand on the liquor question.

"I am strongly in favor of local option," declared the Rev. Dr. S. J. Nicolls, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church. "While I should be very glad if we had state-wide and national prohibition, I do not think we are ready for it yet. I shall vote the prohibition ticket, but I favor local option as the most satisfactory way of settling the liquor problem."

"Prohibition is a fraud," said the Rev. Dr. Samuel Sale, of the Temple Shaare Emeth. "I am opposed to prohibition in all its forms, state-wide and national. But I would not fight against local option because I believe each community should have the right to legislate according to its own needs. I shall vote and use my influence against prohibition."

Archbishop J. J. Glennon, when seen by a Times reporter, declined to state his personal views on prohibition, but gave the following statement, as showing the position

taken by the Catholic Church, and as such, endorsed by all its clergy: "The Catholic Church believes and teaches: (1) That temperance is a virtue—temperance in all things—in eating, drinking, talking and in all the activities of life. (2) That total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors is commendable and advisable for those who are liable to drink too much. (3) It believes in advising the individual not to drink rather than to prohibit him by law."

What It Means.
If state-wide prohibition passes, the increase in the rate of taxes levied upon all kinds of property, including farm lands, business property, homes, the savings of the people in banks, etc., would immediately increase more than forty per cent. Conservatively stated, it means that for every dollar's state tax a citizen pays at the present time, he would have to pay \$1.40 if the Prohibition Amendment passes.

It will wipe out plants which are now interested in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages in Missouri, which have a combined value of \$140,000,000. Why destroy these vast properties when the Interstate Commerce Law will permit liquor to be shipped in by the train loads from other states?

It would wipe out at one fell blow a pay-roll of \$9,000,000 to wage earners now employed in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages in this state. This money supports 195,000 people. Are they not entitled to passing consideration?

During 1906 the cities and counties of Missouri received over \$3,000,000 from saloon licenses, which money was applied to build roads and bridges and otherwise paying the expense of municipal and county governments.

Last year the brewers and distillers of Missouri bought, approximately \$25,000,000 worth of corn. Pass the state-wide prohibition amendment and this great market will be destroyed. A sordid argument, you say? Be that as it may, there is nothing like looking at all sides of a great public question.

The Rule That Won't Work Both Ways.

The fair man stands for the square deal—doing unto others as he would be done by. He believes it is a poor rule that won't work both ways.

If you are that kind of a man, we want a word with you on the matter of State-Wide Prohibition. You have prohibition now in your county through local option—a majority of your people favor it. The large cities regulate the liquor traffic via the High License System—a majority of their people favor it.

Would you think it fair to give the large cities in Missouri the power to vote saloons upon your county regardless of your protest in the matter? Of course you would not, and the cities have no power nor disposition to do such an unjust thing. That's one way the prohibition rule works.

On the other hand, do you think it fair for your county to vote the saloon out of the large cities regardless of their protest in the matter? You have the power and may do that very unjust thing. That's the other way the prohibition rule doesn't work.

If the large cities have no power to make the country "wet," why should the country want to exercise its arbitrary power to make the cities "dry?" Should not the country do as it would be done by? A square deal for the "dry" counties, yes; but why should there not also be a square deal for the cities? Should not the prohibition rule be made to work both ways?